



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,521	10/17/2003	Robert P. Meagley	ITL.1026US (P16713)	2105
21906	7590	10/13/2005	EXAMINER	
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 8554 KATY FREEWAY SUITE 100 HOUSTON, TX 77024			WALKE, AMANDA C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1752	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/688,521	Applicant(s) MEAGLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Amanda C. Walke	Art Unit 1752	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-27.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Amanda C Walke
 Amanda C Walke
 Examiner
 Art Unit: 1752

10/6/05

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: While applicant has argued that the examiner has not pointed to any relevant teachings in the references, the relevant portions of the references which fully discuss the patterning methods of those references have been clearly cited. Also, compounds appearing to meet the limitations of the instant claims for the plasticizer have been cited. As noted by the examiner, the references do teach adding a compound, which happens to be a solvent to the patterned resist either alone or in combination with a developer. As clearly cited in the final office action, Hallock quite clearly teaches the addition of a vapor, preferably, ethyl lactate or propylene glycol methyl ether acetate, to the patterned resist to diffuse into the surface of the resist, lower its Tg and ultimately cause the resist to flow and decrease the surface roughness. On page 6 of the instant specification it is clearly stated that solvents are preferable plasticizers, and that the ones taught by Hallock are preferred by the instant invention. Similar is true with the combination of Saito, Allen, and DeSimone wherein the references prepare a pattern employing a reflow step and a development step wherein the developer is a super critical fluid CO₂ in combination with a solvent, wherein the solvents and the CO₂ developer itself are listed on page 6-page 7 of the instant specification as being suitable plasticizers, thus the developer is added in combination with a plasticizer (also true in the case of Hallock in view of Allen and DeSimone).

This meets the instant claims despite applicant's statement in the after final response that "The assertion is made in paragraph 6 under Response to Arguments that <clearly the Hallock reference teaches applying a plasticizer to a resist film and when applied, there would be a coating of that solvent on the resist at least for a short time, thus, the rejection is maintained.> It seems like what is being said here is that a solvent and a plasticizer are the same thing. It is not believed that there is any basis for such a conclusion. A solvent simply places something in solution. It has nothing to do with plasticizing." Despite applicant's statement, the instant specification teaches that solvents do have something to do with plasticizing, and are in fact, the preferred plasticizers.

Given the cited teachings of the method steps of the reference and the clear teachings that certain solvents that are cited by the references are suitable plasticizers in the instant specification, the rejection is maintained.